L.R

(1891-92)

170-91

1415

Sub: Dispute of Veerabhadrappa & others, relating to Syno. 18 of Gokarj Bachenahalli Devanahalli Taluk

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-92

192 .

(XR)

File No.

Serial Nos

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-15

~~Part~~ B for December 1894

SUBJECT.

Dispute ~~Appeal~~ of Veerabhadrappa & others, relating to S. No. 18 of Gokaraya Beechanahalli Devanahalli Taluk.

To,

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt.

No. 7280 / P.7.182-92 Dt. 26/29 Nov. 1892.

Directing that 4 ac. 29 guntas out of Portion I No. 18 of Gokarayabeechanahalli Devanahalli Taluk be granted to Veerabhadraiah & others on kandayam.

WD 225—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

countermarked

Memo

—

The appeal petition
No: 2237 Dated 22nd
Dec. 1890 is in the
following effect —

1. Our ancestors built
temple, built well,
planted tope &
built other things at
a cost of more than
a 1000 Rs. & were
living in the village
which has existed
for upwards of 400 years
During the last famine
we went over to another
village. Since then
the village has been
un inhabited ("Be-
-chiraakh" = Comfort-
less).

2. Subsequently during
the Survey Settle-
ment we took up
lands — all the lands
of the village. assessed
at Rs 110/. Now we are
in accordance with

on the portion separated
on account of village
site.

Subsequently on
25th September 1888 he
stated before the Chenna-
rayapatna Shekdar
that the assessment
on the (Bhod) no separated
on account of village
site - extent 7-35 acres,
should not be struck off,
that out of the total
extent of 27 acres & 31
guntas of no 116 one
acre had been already
deducted as 'Kharab'
that he had no objection
to Veerabhadra building
on the old village site
deducted at first as
'Kharab', & that
the new no. 18
should not be elimi-
nated from his khata.

On 13th November 1888
Somna Gowda petitioned
the Dy Com - that his
ancestral land as
measured & demarcated
at the time of measure-
-ment should be
conformed to him

Pendency upon the
Survey ~~Supt's~~ orders
we hold ab 110 Bighas
of lands & have ab
twenty Kanisayam
to the extent of Rs 500/.
We have no place to
live in. We pray that
the village site may
be given us & the
Lands and trees belonging
to me (Viabhadra?)
but now included under
'Batayi' restored to me.
There is no other site so
convenient as this as
regards water supply &c:

Somabha lives in a
different village. He has
no right to the village
site. He was also told.
stated that he does not
want the village site.

On 27th April 1887 Gooda
Somappa petitioned
the Authorities to the effect
that orders should be
issued to deny Kanisayam
from him only for
the land remaining.
& to grant the assistance

the Survey Superintendent's Orders, and in view to secure the property acquired by our ancestors. We represented that we had no place to live in. Then the Assistant Collector (Mr. Rutherford) ordered that the village site would be separated & allowed. He passed Orders (1) in the "Rasul Baki" account.

3 In the year "Sarvajeet" (1887-88) the portion of No. 116 containing the temple, the site, the pond &c and measuring about 7 acres was sub-divided & we put up the Boundary stones. On enquiry into No 2313[X] given to me (us) regarding correction made in the Akarband - the Jamabandi Officer Major Macaulay gave orders to the above effect.

(1) The orders are to the effect that Pattedari (Khoja) son-in-law, or neighbour should pay for money advanced (of No. 116) - Trimbakrao says that there are a temple & a Kunta built by his ancestors, & some trees planted by them - The Priest Pahami says that some trees belong to him - The portion containing his trees, the Kunta &c together with the old village site, should be made into a separate No: & brought on account as Kharab. He (Trimbakrao) should not fell green trees he should take dried ones, he should plant trees. The Priest should be allowed as public charity. Other rights reserved subject to further

Note this endorsement does not appear to have been produced by the Petitioners.

and that no land forming part of this patta should be excluded on account of village site.

Order no: 874
Dy 13 November 83.

The above petition was sent to the Amildar for report.

R/. 1339
Dy 6.2.89.

The Amildar reported that new no 18 had been brought under Kharab & a conceded 'a Kanbara' received from the Survey Deptt, & that the no: had been accordingly ordered to be struck off the old patta.

Order no. 1624
Dy 26th Feb 89

The Dy Collr (Major Macin-tire) then addressed the Survey Supdt. - the Letter is in the file -

no 67 Dated 3rd may 1889.

The Sur Supdt. replied that necessary orders had been issued for the survey being re-assessed

The Akarbund Dars... Vide Mr. Mackay's
Conceded afresh Yadi no 255
of 24th June 1889.

Mr. Krishnamurti - Dy
Comr. then passed
order no: 759 of 31st
Dec. 1890.
(The order is in
English. It is in the
file.)

In reply the Bunder
submitted his report no. 29°
in English - of 8th Jany 1890.

The Eng Govt then
wanted a list of
the trees on nos.
16, 17, & 18 order no: 436
of 21. 8. 90.

The list submitted with report no: 586
contains the following Dated 19. 9. 90.
particulars -

1. Sy. no 18 has been
formed so as to include
the portion containing
trees in the no: 16. (the
former no 16).

2

2" The trees in no 18 are

2. Banyan.
1. Mango
7. Tamarind
5. Country fig
1. Wood apple.
6. Coombee trees big.
There are small ones also which cannot be counted.

3. One Mango tree might have been noted in Eden in the Gida Patrika through mistake as the other tree stands on no. 5 in the khata of Virabhadra.

One fig tree is stated to have fallen down 3 or 4 years ago & taken away by Virabhadra (Hunn the present no: is noted above.)

In nos 16 & 19 there are Coombe, Poondi Sandal wood & other trees. & they cannot be counted.

In no: 18 the Coombe trees might have been then small & omitted

to be mentioned &

That
Mr Pahami showed
the no of trees as
follows: -

7 Tamarind trees
6. Fig trees
Banyan
2.
2. Mango
1. Byala (wood apple)
3. Coconut

21 trees. ~~cocoa~~.

Mr Thar Patrick Cor
-ners the following
remark.

Out of the 7 tamarind
trees 2 are mam
& 5 Batayi (Good).
The remaining 14
trees appear to belong
to M. Veerabhadrappa.

Viahadrayya in
his deposition of 4.4.90
before the Amildar
deposed that the 5
tamarind trees
were before survey

on which the 13 trees allowed by the Dy Comr stand. and as to whether this land cant include any portion of the old village site.

A sketch map shewing all details would be useful.

I am making an enquiry into this matter. Mr VK 10.2.92

On looking at the stamps affixed to the Appeal Petition (No 2237.) the following were observed

1. One stamp of the value of one rupee name of purchaser Ramanenpar - Date of purchase - 14.2.90. Vendor - B. Ramanpundasharti.

This stamp is still un punched

The other stamps which appear to have been punched - is of the value of one annas

Let me know the result of Mathuppa's enquiry. AS. 11/2/92

Sold to one Secretary
or Jamadar
28.4.90 by vendor
"Har: Ve: Krishna"

The book in which
the appeal is registered
shows Rs 2/- as the
value of the stamp
on the Petition.

On the Abstract
of the Petn it is stated
to have been suffi-
-ciently stamped.
The appeal Petn is
dated 22nd Dec 90.

Who could have
been at the bottom
of this mischief-
has to be ascertained.

Submitted for
orders.

9/2/92.

76

Petition No 2237 of 1891-92

Appellant

Virabhadrappa
Patel of
Gokerebachalli
Devanahalli Taluq

Respondent

Somappa.

Respondent is Brother-in-law Kempabika held 2 candies of land of old Number 35 (about 20½ acres) on Halkaval assessment of Rs 8. It is not known when she acquired the land, but the account of Ananda 1854-55 shows that the Patel had [illegible]. During the Survey in 1887, this number together with the old assessment

village site ~~and its~~ [illegible]

adjacent lands was made into 2 numbers and one of them No 16 registered in the name of Respondent, No 17 being treated as Jonah's. Appellant's then claimed a portion of the land No 16, on the ground that it partly formed their old village site and partly contained trees planted by their ancestors. On this, No 16 was divided into 3 numbers as noted in the margin, No 18 was treated as Khazab, and the other two numbers were allowed to remain with the Respondent. On the appeal of the Respondent No 18

Jus-9

(1) No 16 – 27.31

(2) " 17 – 25.33

	acres.	cents
No 16	11.22	17
" 18	7.25	11
" 19	8.24	12
Total	27.31	40
Decree Khazab	1.	
	26.31	

The Re. assessed and
made one to him in 1889.

The Appellants
complained against this
settlement and the Dep.
Com.r finally decided
in 1890, that they
~~Appellants~~
might enjoy the produce
of the trees (13) situated
on No 18 as they were —
planted by their ancestors
but that the land should
remain with the Respondent
The appeal is against this
order.

The present enquiry
shows that out of the
area of No 18, 1.16 Acres Qrds
belongs to the old village
site, and 2.38 Acres Qrds
by 13 trees belonging to the
Appellants, 5, belonging to

Government and 2. trees
belonging to Saunders

Appellants have strictly speaking,
no right either to their old
abandoned village site
(the abandonment having taken place
so long ago as 1878) or
to the trees planted by
their ancestors on the tracts
adjoining the old village
site on which they never
paid any assessment.
But the Respondent has
still less claim to the
land as he never held
it before it was granted
to him in 1887. As
between the Appellants &
Respondent, the former
have certainly better
claims to their old

village site, and to the land occupied by the trees planted by the Chiefs and the Government also note that the old village site included in No 18 Contains a Pagoda and a Pond belonging to the village Community & has not abandoned the village site

Judging from the areas of the several numbers given, Govt presume that No 17 treated as Jmail includes a portion of old No 35 belonging to Kempakka

~~If so, the best course~~
~~seems to be to~~ ~~Chief~~ ~~Exempt~~
~~Nos 17 & 18 and divide~~
~~them into separate~~

1 Cause it is clear that No 18 comprises 4.9 of village site &c, & the remg area of No 18, plus the area of 16.19 or less than the area represented by 2 Candies, i.e 36½ acres of No 35

The Govt Agent

numbers or sub-numbers,
viz, (a) one or more corresponding
to the area of field No. 35
held by Kempathia,
(b) one or more corresponding
to the area occupied by
the old village site,
(c) one or more corresponding
to the area occupied by
the trees planted by the
ancestors of the Appellants
outside of the village site
and (d) one or more
corresponding to the land
not coming under any
of the above descriptions
and to make one to
the Respondent (a) the
Numbers corresponding to
the old No. 35 field

direct that the
area represented
in red & represented
by the old village
site & the area
occupied by the
trees planted
by the ancestors
of the Appellants
& 4.9
be made over
to them, a corresponding
area being given
to the Respt from
No 17 of the works
in the suit.

A Supt of Survey is requested
to carry out the
above order.

Sd
14/10/192

Ord 15/10

Ord 15/10

Ord as referred to in
Supt of Survey whereon orders
have been issued.
Sd

No. 57 Re (1)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition ~~is~~ No 2237
dated 22nd Dec. 1890 received at the
Dewan's Office from Veerabhadrappa
Pattegar of Gortary
Bachenahalli, Devanhalli
Taluk.

is forwarded, together with its two
enclosures, to the Dy Comr,
Bangalore Distt, for
the Submission of Report
& Papers thereof.

By Order,

Bangalore,
22/12/1890.

Asst. Secretary.

Draft as per
C's order
22/12/90

Precis of correspondence connected with the dispute regarding S.No 16 of Sakarabachalli village Devanhally Taluk.

One Kempakka Patel of S.No 35 of Sakarabachalli measuring about 2 Candies of dry land on a Kuthkaial Candayam of Rs: 5-11-5, which during the survey with the abandoned village site, formed into Survey No 16 measuring 29 acres and 31 Guntas Minus an acre, Kharab, assessed at Rs: 40-0-0 At the time of the survey Settlement the whole Number was registered in the name of Kempakka Son-in-law, Somappa and Pattah issued to him in 1887.

2. Immediately after this, Varadhadevaiah, who also held some lands in the Bichuak village appears to have complained to the

Settlement Officer stating that the site on which his Temple and trees etc stood were included in Survey No 16 and that he had no site left to build houses for his Lyots cultivating the lands of the Beehiruh village. That Officer passed orders on the Lysal Patrika to exclude the building site and trees claimed by Veerabhadriah from Survey No 16 and to form it into a separate No. Somappa also agreed to this, vide his petition dated August 1857 and No 16 was accordingly subdivided into three Nos, as particularized in the margin. No 18 included the site and the village site it was agreed fully, but subsequently it was considered necessary to strike off the assessment and leave it as village

No	A.	G
16 –	11 –	22 Bn. 17.
18 –	7 –	25 Bn. 11.
19 –	8 –	24 Bn. 12.
	27 – 31 –	40

subsequently ordered the Amildar to report what trees there were in Nos 16, 18 and 19 and the mode of their enjoyment.

6- The Amildar in his No 745 dated 8th July 1890, stated that there were 22 trees in Survey No 18 and those claimed by Veerabhadrappa were specially reserved in his favor, that the 2 Inamti trees in favor of the Talwar and Shanbogue and the right of Government to five unreserved trees are also noted in the survey papers.

7- The D. Commissioner & Mr Andrews Revenue heard the advocates on both sides on 8th October 1890 and decided that Veera-bhadrappa should

28

enjoy 13 trees in Survey
No. 18, as he was entitled
to them.

Benjamin Aug
for Chief Conservator

Bangalore
3/6th October 91

29

(General Serial No. 30).

189/98

From The Dist. Secretary Galagama

To The Govt. Comm. Kanjirapalli

Dated 11th

Despatched 22nd } Feb. 1898

Received

Enclosures No. (Single)

General No. 12926 Ro.

No. 233

Dist. Govt. Secretary submitting the proceedings connected with the dispute relating to S. No. 13 Agastaramkulam Chittoor Taluk.

—x—

With reference to the above marginal communication I have the honor to state that the extent of land under the 18 trees, which the Adikesavalu Perumal Viratharajaya enjoys, stands, and whether this land includes any portion of the old village site.

A sketch map showing



82

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Petition
~~Appeal~~ No. 2287 of '92.

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Vishvadrayha Patten of Gorebachahalli, Devanhalli Taluk.		Kempayya.

Decision, of 15th Oct 92.

Rec'd in the in-am complaint
held 2 parcels of land, viz. 26½ acres on Nichkal account of Rs 11-8
It is not known when the acquired the
land, but the account of Ananda 1854-55 shows
that the then held it. During the
Survey in 1887, the number together with
the old abandoned village site and
with the adjacent lands was made into
2 numbers and one of them Rs 5 registered

	Acres-gr.
(1) Rs 16-	27.31
(2) " 5-	25.35

in the name of the
-pondent, Rs 1-8 being
treated as jonaka. Rejected the claim

a portion of the land in R.S. 33, on the ground that a party formed their old village site & partly contained trees planted by their ancestor. In this R.S. was divided into 3 numbers as noted in the margin.

	acres	Acres.
R.S. 16 —	1.22.	17
" 18 —	7.25	11
" 19 —	8.24	12
Total	27.31	40.

Deduct Claim 1.

Remr = 26.31.

R.S. 18 was treated as Schedule, the other two numbers were allowed to remain with the Capt.

On the Schedule upon Capt. R.S. 18 was re-received & made over to him in 1869.

2. The Appts complained against the settlement title by Com. Smith decided in 1869; that the might enjoy the produce of the trees (3) situated on R.S. 18 as they were planted by their ancestors & that the land should remain with Capt. The applnt is against this order.

3. The present enquiry shows that out of the area of R.S. 1.16 belongs to the old village site and 3.23 occupied by 13 trees belonging to the Appts, 5 belonging to Govt and 2 trees belonging to Chamdaro.

x 26.31.
2-33 30
Wh 3.23
Ch 3.08
Govt 1.00
Ch 1.00
4

4. Whilst there exists clearings, no right exists to their old abandoned village site, the abandonment having taken place so long ago as 1875 or to the trees planted by their ancestors on the waste adjoining the old village site or which has never been any exclusive use the Respts have still less claim to the land as he never held it before it was granted to him in 1897. As between the Appellants & Respt, the former have certainly better claims to their old village site and to the land occupied by the trees planted by their ancestors and the Court also note that the old village site included in Ex. 8 contains graves and sacred belonging to the village community which surrounded the village site.

5. Judging from the areas of the several numbers given, Court presume that Ex. 17 is treated as general evidence & notice of old Ex. 30 belonging to Complaintiff since it is clear that Ex. 8 comprises 4.39 of

35

village site &c, the remaining area of the S. plain the area being is less than the area executed by a Cadastre of old but is, as a area. The Govt therefore direct that the area in be executed by the old village site the area occupied by the trees planted by the ancestors of the Akkas &c. & no new title a certificate are being given to the Govt from Rs. 17 if he wishes to have it.

The Supdt of Rev. Survey is requested to carry out the above order.

By order

Ex Chief Secretary.

24/10/92

5844 dt 15-9-92

Copy to Govt. Engineer Asst. with the Govt. letter cited Rs. 9:1033 dt 17th March 92.

5845 dt 15-9-92

By order

Ex Chief Secretary.

No. 6(1) 893

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
Oct 1892.

Endorsement granted to Virabhadrappa Petition of Gudiere
Kacharakatti Devanhalli Tk
in reply to their Petition Registered No. 2237 dated 22nd Sept 92.

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ are referred to the Supdt of Ex: Cir:
ey to whom order have been issued.

2. The enclo: are herewith returned

24/10/92

" By Order,"

Ex-Supdt. 25/10/92
for Chief Secretary.

ME.
MP.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000

With enclosures
Encl issued 25-10-92

No. 622 (7) 87

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 2nd January 92

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Memo No 0845
dated 29th Nov. forwarding copy of the
Decision of Government on Petition of
Ryots of 89-92, I have the honor to solicit
more explicit instructions as to the terms
on which the area of 2 acres 30 guntas
out of Survey No, 3 comprising village
site Nos of Yelachahalli in the Ma-
-ranhalli Estate is intended to be
made over to the applicants, whether
on Kandayam or fee of assessment.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant

Lieut Colonel
Superintendent
Survey

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Supdt. of Census Operations in Mysore.

Dated 26 Nov./92

Despatched 29.

Received

Enclosures No. ~~with enclosures~~

General No. 7280
Fcl. No. 82-92

Directing that Inam and Sy grants out of S.No. 8 of Gokerebachalli, Devanhalli Taluk, be granted to Venkatappa rather (Appa) as Rama Jagam.

References to be marked.

Read -

Letter from the Supdt of Rev. Survey, dt 2nd Nov: 1899, No 522, soliciting instructions as to the tenure on which the area of 4 acres 39 guntas out of Survey No: 18 comprising the village site of Gokerebachahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk, is intended to be made over to the Appellants, whether on Kandayam or free of assessment.

— a —

Order thereon.

The 4 acres 39 guntas out of Survey No: 18, should be granted to the Appellants on Kandayam.

Re-draft. Orders 28/11.

for Chief Secretary.

To

The Supdt of Rev: Survey

~~returning the enclosure~~

Ack 28/11

28/11/99

(General Serial No. 30.)

8/11

1893-94.

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 18th July 1893.

Despatched 19th Do

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & 2 P.

General No.
D No. 66.

Correspondence ending with Government order
No. 5844 dated 29th October
P.F. 182
last, regarding the survey
No. 16 in the Gokere Bachu
-halli, Devanhalli Talk.

Referring to the above,
has the honor to state
that Respondent Somappa
is reported to have expressed
his reluctance to take
a corresponding extent

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—27-1-93.—5,000.

21/7/93

42

of land from Sl. No. 17 on the ground that it is not fit for cultivation.

2. The file of Vernacular Correspondence ending with the 1st General Assistant Commissioner's Yadi No. 667 is, herewith, submitted for reference.

M Ramachandra Rao
For Dy Commissioner.

WRG

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

2379

1894/95 Pet 153

From
The Commissioner
Tanjore District

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government

Dated 20th August, 94

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.
No. 232

His Petition dated 18th
Pet. 182-94
of the 5th May Enquiring whether the
Government order that
4 acres and 39 Cawnies
out of Survey No. 18 in
Eriki Kachanthally,
Devanthalli Taluk
was made over to the
Appellants Viraraghava-
raja and others in
Petition No. 237 of
1891-92 before the
Government.

Begs to reply in
the negative and

The 1st General Asst:
Commissioner's Memo:
Re. 85 of the 8th Instant,
which is herewith Sub-
mitted with enclosures.
The Superintendent of
Survey will be asked
for information as to
whether he has carried
out the alterations
ordered by Government
and if he has done so,
the applicants will
be put in possession
of the land. The respond-
ent has, as reported
in this office the 6th
Instant 18th July 1893,
decided to take a
portion of it 5.17 in
exchange.

Thos Gillespie

for Commissioner

WM

No 86
on file

67 5/58

C. A. 438

Memo

Reference desired to Commissioners circular
No 133 of the 17th ultimo giving cover to
Chief Secretary's circular No 18389
Dated 13th inst
re Mr Smith's Leave Arrangements.

Attached
Ill.
11/7/58

---

2. Circular No 133 of the 30th ult
Leave Arrangements —

Circular regarding Magistrates Leave Arrangements at that Capital

Comaghan having objected to part
with Leave by Junior Magistrate
effect was given to the arrangement
to i.e. the Appellant. Erabbinaghan
& Otter were appointed Magistrates
for said district & have entered upon
number.

Leave received & Circulated.

Asst Secretary
8th August 58

Registered
Assistant Secretary
Banagher Dist

Left

Proceedings of the Court of the
Assistant Collector & Magistrate of Mysore

12/1

Read

Letter no 232 dated 20th August 96
from the Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District reporting
that no appeal was given by —
Government order no. 5844/D.T.182
dated 15th October 1892 directing
that 4 acres and 39 guntas out of
S. no. 18 in Yelenbaccanalli, Devanhalli
Taluk should be made over to
Appellant Venkatadrappa and
others on the ground that the
Respondent was directed to give
up S. no. 18 and to take a —
corresponding portion of S. no. 17
in exchange.

No. 9951/Dis.352-2 D. 14-12-96/15

Order

Appeal may be given to

Ito order of 10th October 1892 ley

putting appellants in possession

of 4 acres 39 guntas out of S. No. 18

A similar area out of No. 17 may

be separately demarcated and given

to [illegible] respondent, if he wishes

to have it [illegible]

[illegible]

Dated [illegible]

Yours [illegible]

Mr. Chief Secretary

To

The Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore Dist.

[illegible] 25/10

Gen'l Records

Please put up the file relating to Govt Orr: No: 5844 of 15-10-92 as referred to in the letter P.182

AHC 6/3/01 Petr Arr:- P.Nr.182-92 containing the letter of the Govt Secretariat dated 6/3/01

6/3/01

Please see Govt Orr: No: 5 in the file

AHC 6/3/01 Sealed

7-3-01

Submitted to (182) Court

Govt has passed G.O. P2 18 dt 15th Oct 92 is 816 in the file. The respondent demands a sum of Rs 43 from Rs 1 instead of Rs 17 as stated in para 5 of the order. The Dy Commr recommends the grant as Rs 17 is meagre for cultivation.

Recd 19/3/01

Submitted 22-3-01 The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District has received files orders in proc No 945 dated 4th March 1894. He does not write his order. He while he agrees

Petn 2.3.01 No 57/3/01

(General Serial No. 1901 G.O. 582)

1901

From The Dy. Commissioner Bangalore Dist.

To The Secretary to Government [illegible] and General Department

Dated Bangalore

Despatched 1st March

Received

General No. } 1901.
No. 7

Enclosures Number.

[illegible] Gokak [illegible]

5/52

D No 1327
Revenue Branch

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 23rd February 1893.

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue Genl Department

Sir,

I beg to submit that Government, in their Proceedings No. 58141 — dated the 15th October 1892, (Page 182) ordered that Somappa, holder of Survey No 18 in the Gokare Kachahalli village in the Devanahalli Taluk, should make over 4 acres and 29 guntas out of it to Veerabhadrappa and others of the said village to construct dwelling houses thereon, he (Somappa) was directed to pay

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

Secretary

Dated 28/10/95

To

The Revenue Secretary,

Sir,

I am directed to refer to your letter No. 5-82-95-Rev. dated 10.10.95 and to say that the Government have decided to grant ex-gratia relief of Rs. 4,000/- (Rupees four thousand only) to the next of kin of the deceased Shri Ramesh Chandra Sharma, Lekhpal, Halka No. 91, Tehsil Sadar, Bareilly, who died on 27.7.95 in a road accident.

2. The amount may be paid to the next of kin of the deceased from the Chief Minister's Discretionary Fund.

3. The receipt of the letter may please be acknowledged.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

Secretary

Received as 3 and pies wrong.
The balance 4 - 2 to be returned

1900

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.
Revenue & General Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Distt.

Dated 18th

Despatched 5th August 1900

Received

General No. Cot

No. 182 J 92

Enclosure No.

(248)

His letter No 1327 J 282 : 01
Soliciting sanction for the
Grant of a portion of S. No 1
of Yokarebanhally, Devan
-Hally Taluk, to Somappa
in lieu of the lands taken
from him. ———

———

I am returning the re-
-cords received 25 with
the above [illegible] Petition, I have
the honor to ob-

(No reference
necessary)

that the Dy Commr had received explicit orders in Govt Proceedings No 9757 dy 14.12.1894 and that he does not refer to it.

2. The Dy Commr is also requested to be so good as to report if appellants (Veerabhadrappa and others) in the original case have been given 4 acres 39 guntas of S.No 18 or not.

3. About Somappa being given an equivalent in No 17 or in No 1, the Dy Commr is requested to make a separate recommendation after ~~enquiring~~ the necessary investigation, as it is an independent question.

By order

Dfl
C,

Asst Secy

being sold Bataraji
Amararaji

The Shanbhog states that before the survey the mango trees used to be auctioned. The tamarind trees are in nobody's enjoyment. (The 5 trees are meant evidently) They were also planted by Vira Bhadrayya ancestor. Being a Bechirakh village he takes a portion of the fruit & some a portion. As the tamarind trees were on Govt land they were auctioned also planted by Virabhadrayya's ancestors.

Both the above pantchas the Amildar submitted his English report.

(no: 290 & 8 July 90 already referred to)

M^r. Madhavarao
Dykes decided
that "the Petr" (viz.
Bhadraya) has entitled
to the 13 biss standing
in Sur No: 18 in
Sonnappa's holding
as per details given
in Amin Ukree No
586 dt 19th Sept 1890

dt 8.10.90

The above particulars
do show that the
appeal is with regard
to the village site, with
Virabhadra's claim
to the 5 kanarees
trees treated as Bateyi.

The date of order
of Sur. Supdt. disposing
of the village site is
3d May 1889. It
is relating to the
re-assessment of
Sur. No 18 referred to
in para 4 of the
petition.

The Dykes will
be asked as to
the extent of land

19

Read letter from the Supt of Rev
dated 20 Jan 1892 No 622 Solicits
instructions as to the terms on which ----

The 4 acres & 39 cuntas
out of Survey No 18, should be
granted to the applicants on
Kandayam.

21/11

21/11/92

Recd

21 Vole

(General Serial No. 30).

OFFICE OF THE
OCT 31
MYSORE

6554
P. 42

1891-92

From The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 6th October 1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & a file

General No.
D No. 559.

W. Papers.

Chief Secretary's Official Memo No. 51 dated 22nd June last, forwarding petition from Veerabhadrappa of Gokrébachahalli, for submission of Proceedings and a précis thereof.

In returning the enclosures received with the above, has the honor to forward herewith, the Proceedings connected with the dispute of Survey No. 16 of Gokare Bachahalli village

Submitted to the Council

10/91 AR

Petition
Os
as
19/10/91

Submitted
to Council.

92

The appeal is with
the Village Sale for
Council yet.
Memo under appeal
is not enclosed
as desired on the point.
The Memo under reply
that the question relating to
village sale has already been
dealt by the Survey Deptt. what
was done then? Did
Deputy file No 18 appeal to
4 of the case?
Memo under reply
21-10-91

To the same No. 1292 6/23 of 21/10/91

92

together with a copy of Precis thereof, as requested in the above.

[illegible]
pro Offg Dy Commissioner

Recd

appl[illegible] apl allow appl[illegible]
13 thus stands on Nr 18
what is the extent of la
on w[illegible] the said trees st
does this land inclu
any portion of the old
block Sth ?

GH
22/1/92

2/16

Submitted with further memo for orders.

H
9th Feby 92

Site.

3- Sonnappah not abiding by his former consent, complained to Major Macintire and prayed that No 18 might remain in his possession as before and that Veera-bhadriah should be granted a village site, somewhere else.

4- Upon a reference to the Survey Superintendent by Major Macintire against excluding No 18 from No 16 as the Puttahdar Veerabhadriah objected to it. No 18 was reassessed.

5- Later on, Veerabhadriah asked permission to utilize a tree standing on No 18, as the right was conceded to him. Sonnappah objected to this and presented a petition to Mr Krishna Murti, who heard both parties in January 1890 and found that the land

Submitted.
Major Macintire's letter to the Survr Genl's Dated 26.2.89. No 1624 is to the effect that Sonnappa was unwilling to give up No 18 the insertion of Veerabhadriah's name here appears to be a mistake

Reassessed.
The Survr Genl in his doc: No: 67 of 30. May to the Dist Collr Bang: 89 stated that orders had been issued to the Survr No: being the re-assessed "Corrected akarband" accordingly.
The "akarbands" appears to have been corrected on 24.6.89.

was duly assessed and registered in Sonnappa's name, but no reservation of trees was made. Strictly speaking Sonnappa would under the Survey tenure be entitled to trees; but as he admitted before him that 2 other trees entered in the Jodapatti-ka, as Government trees, are still sold by Government for Amrai, Sonnappa's claim to the trees standing on the land is analogous to that of Government, so the treatment of one must be applied to the other and if upon enquiry it is so found it must then be held that although the reservation of trees was not recorded in writing, yet the parties understood that the trees had been reserved, and

Assessment

(General Serial No. 30)

OF THE
12590
16 MAR. 92
OF MYS

1394 / 80 / 63

From The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 17th March 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file & sketch map

General No.

D No. 1033.

In his docket No. 12926/233 dated 15th Ultimo, re-turning for further report proceedings connected with the dispute, relating to Survey No. 16 of Gokare Bachahalli, Devanhully Taluk.

"In resubmitting the Proceedings, received with the above, has the honor to state that the extent of land on which the

Ref. Mark 18/3/92

Further information has been received with a sketch map

Submitted to the Council with Ref Mark 22/3/92

22/3/92

Read for [illegible]

[illegible]

22/3/92

[illegible]

Perused for Mr
on 21st Mar 92

11/4/92

11/4/92

AG No. 15th Sept 92

Mr 21/7/92 19-3-92

trees enjoyed by Veerabha-
-drayya Stand, is 3 acres
and 23 guntahs and
this land includes about
30 guntahs of the old
village site.

2. A sketch map
showing all details is
also herewith submitted.

M Laing Meason

for Deputy Commissioner

37

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892. 4597

From The Supdt Mysore Rev: Survey

To (1)

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated Bangalore 2nd Nov/92

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 622

No.

In reply to his Memo No 5845 of 29-10-92 forwarding copy of his Decision Pt 182 on Petition No 22377 10-92

SUBJECT.

Soliciting more explicit instructions as to the tenure on which the area of 4 acres 09 guntas out of Survey No. 18 comprising village site &c. of Gokarebachahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk is intended to be made over to the appellants, whether on kandayam or free of assessment.

Peta Bor Dasa 2/11/92

Ref 91 3/11/92

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the same No 7280 d/26/11/92
P.T. 182-92

3/11/92

+ 469

(10)

R170 9/1-10

From the Asst Commr & 2329 20/8/94 Gen

To

The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

No 18889 / P.F. 182-92 dt 5.5.94 / 8

Enc: one file of Vin. records.

His No 66 dated 18th July last stating with reference to the order of Govt dated 15 Oct 1892 on the appeal of Virubhadrappa & others of Gokerebachanhalli, Devanhalli Taluk, that the Respondent Somnappa does not wish to have any portion of Survey No 17 in lieu of the portion ordered to be granted out of Survey No 18 to the appellants

---

With reference to the above has the honor to state that the Survey Superintendent was, in this office No 7280 / P. 182-92 dated 26th Nov. 1892 in reply to his No 622 dated 2nd Idem, informed that 4 acres & 3.9 guntas out of Survey No 18 should be granted

to the appellants on Tuesday
and to enquire whether or not
effect has been given to this
part of the order
The Exhibits are returned
By order

Chief Clerk

9/ to report if appellant in the ~~O~~ original case have been given 4.39 in survey no 18 or not.

About somabba being given an equivalent in no 17 or 2 in no 1 this is an independent question - on which the deputy Commissioner may make a separate recommendation after the necessary investigation

28/7/1909

29/7

1.8.01

52

the said area and take in lieu, a corresponding area out of Survey No. 17 in the same village; but he did not agree to it. Thereupon, a notice was issued to him stating that if he failed to give up the land, as directed, action under Section 209 of the Land Revenue Code would be taken. In reply, he prays that a portion of Survey No. 1 in the same village (which is a ground land) may be given instead of assignment in No. 17, the latter being unfit for cultivation. I therefore, solicit the sanction of Government to the grant of a portion of Survey No. 1, viz, 4-39 in lieu of his land ordered to be taken from him. The records on the subject are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.